

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

REG'D 20 DEC 2005

WIPO

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference FP2135	FOR FURTHER ACTION See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)	
International application No. PCT/SG 2004/000013	International filing date (day/month/year) 14 January 2004 (14.01.2004)	Priority Date (day/month/year)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC IPC⁷: G06F 17/27, G06F 17/28, G06F 17/40, G06F 17/60, G06F 19/00		
Applicant BANERJEE AROOP KUMAR		

1. This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examination Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.
2. This REPORT consists of a total of 4 sheets, including this cover sheet.

☐ This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e., sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).

These annexes consist of a total of _____ sheets.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|--|
| I. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Basis of the opinion |
| II. | <input type="checkbox"/> | Priority |
| III. | <input type="checkbox"/> | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| IV. | <input type="checkbox"/> | Lack of unity of invention |
| V. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| VI. | <input type="checkbox"/> | Certain documents cited |
| VII. | <input type="checkbox"/> | Certain defects in the international application |
| VIII. | <input type="checkbox"/> | Certain observations on the international application |

Date of submission of the demand <div style="text-align: center;">12.01.2005</div>	Date of completion of this report <div style="text-align: center;">22 November 2005 (22.11.2005)</div>
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/AT Austrian Patent Office Dresdner Straße 87 A-1200 Vienna Facsimile No. 1/53424/200	Authorized officer <div style="text-align: center;">KÖGL C.</div> Telephone No. 1/53424/440

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/SG 2004/000013

I. Basis of the report

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application:*

☒ the international application as originally filed

☐ the description:

pages _____, as originally filed

pages _____, filed with the demand

pages _____, filed with the letter of _____.

☐ the claims:

pages _____, as originally filed

pages _____, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19

pages _____, filed with the demand

pages _____, filed with the letter of _____.

☐ the drawings:

pages _____, as originally filed

pages _____, filed with the demand

pages _____, filed with the letter of _____.

☐ the sequence listing part of the description:

pages _____, as originally filed

pages _____, filed with the demand

pages _____, filed with the letter of _____.

2. With regard to the **language**, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).

☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).

☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rule 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, the international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:

☐ contained in the international application in printed form.

☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.

☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.

☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

☐ the description, pages _____.

☐ the claims, Nos. _____.

☐ the drawings, sheets/fig _____.

5. ☐ This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).**

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as „originally filed“ and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rules 70.16 and 70.17).

** Any replacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this report.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.
PCT/SG 2004/000013

V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims	1-9	YES
	Claims	----	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	1-9	YES
	Claims	----	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-9	YES
	Claims	----	NO

Citations and explanations (Rule 70.7)

We reference to the reply to the Extended Search Report regarding the International Patent Application PCT/SG2004/000013 dated on 11 November 2005, we hereby send you the Examination Report. The subject-matter claimed in the **claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8 and 9** relates to a '**computer program**' as such. For clarification it is stated that a claim must not contain any terms like "program", "application software", "entry program" etc.. In some countries such methods aren't patentable.

However, in view of the arguments filed in the answer the subject matter of **claims 1 to 9** resulted in the judgement that the present application is novel and involve an inventive step. The following documents are mentioned in the International Search Report; the numbering will be adhered to in the Examination Report too:

D1: US 6 377 965 B1

D2: US 5 237 691 A

D3: Leaflet L6 "Working with Indic Text (Windows 2000)"

D4: "Welcome to the Homepage of Parabaas Axar"

D5: US 5 185 857 A

The cited document **D1** discloses an automatic word completion system for partially entered data. **D1** is considered to represent the most relevant document. The examiner can not agree the principal of the following statement (see page 2 paragraph 5): "Consequently, the new citation cannot be considered for novelty as at least one essential feature is not present in the citation." Firstly document **D1** has been considered for **novelty and inventive step** in the International Search Report dated. Secondly the citation can be considered for **novelty** although one feature is not present in the citation. For a person skilled in the art it is obvious to appliance the missing feature and come to the subject matter of **claimed invention**. **It is not required that features are literately named in the citation but may also implicitly disclosed.**

However, the examiner agrees the following arguments stated in the answer: "An issue relevant to Indic languages, but not so for Latin-based languages such as English, is the

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

Continuation of: Box V (page 1)

aspect that two characters may be joined together to form a single character. A person selecting a word or sentence in an Indic language may not immediately recognize which characters to use individually. Thus, the present invention by offering multiple suggestions based on variations of a selected character, assists the user in identifying the required compound characters by seeing the various options of combined characters based upon permutation of the selected character. This is not an issue with Latin-based alphabet in that each character of, for instance, an English word is easily identifiable within the 26 letter alphabet, making entry of text into a document well suited to a keyboard. The issue for any particular Indic language is the full character set which may include many permutations and a wide variety of combined and individual characters making entry by a keyboard very poorly suited to Indic languages."

Consequently, any system requiring the entry of text directed in a Latin script language will be inappropriate and therefore irrelevant to the present invention which is directed to Indic languages for the reasons stated above. In the light of the arguments above, the subject matter of **claims 1 to 9** is novel and inventive in respect of the cited document **D1**. **D1** describes a general state of the art.

D2 shows for example a computer system including a work station 110 with CPU 115, display 112, keyboard 113 and mouse 114 with multitasking capability. **D3** refers to a Leaflet L6 Working with Indic Text. The computers running Windows 2000 all have suitable fonts for displaying documents and web pages containing Indic text. **D4** describes a Word Processor or Web Publication Tool that allows you to write Indian languages in Roman letters using a simple transliteration scheme. **D5** teaches a computer system including a SCSI (small computer serial interface) controller in a multitasking environment. The system further comprises a graphical user interface. Documents **D2 to D5** show a standard technology as well.

Summarizing, the subject matter of **claims 1 to 9** is novel and inventive in respect of the cited prior art. **Claims 1 to 9** are novel and hence patentable. The cited documents **D1 to D5** describe the general state of the art, which is not considered to be of a particular relevance. The industrial applicability is acknowledged.